

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| 09/666,524 | 09/20/2000 | Neil J. Goldfine | 1884.1020-006 | 6927 |
| 21005 7. | 5 7590 10/06/2003 | | EXAMINER | |
| HAMILTON, | BROOK, SMITH & RE | SNOW, WALTER E | | |
| 530 VIRGINIÁ ROAD P.O. BOX 9133 CONCORD, MA 01742-9133 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 2862 | |
| | | | DATE MAILED: 10/06/2003 | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | _ | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | |
| | 09/666,524 | GOLDFINE ET AL. | | | | |
| Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | |
| | Walter E. Snow | 2862 | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply | pears on the cover sheet with the c | rrespondence address | | | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status | I36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin ly within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a. cause the application to become ABANDONE | nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133). | | | | |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 | <u>July 2003</u> . | | | | | |
| 2a)☐ This action is FINAL . 2b)☑ The | nis action is non-final. | | | | | |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims | | | | | | |
| 4) Claim(s) 107-121 and 145-186 is/are pending in the application. | | | | | | |
| 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra | wn from consideration. | | | | | |
| 5)⊠ Claim(s) <u>109,112-119,161 and 173-175</u> is/are allowed. | | | | | | |
| 6) Claim(s) 107,108,110,111,120,121,156-159,163,164 and 179-182 is/are rejected. | | | | | | |
| 7) Claim(s) <u>145-155,160,162,165-172</u> and 176-1 | | | | | | |
| 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. | | | | | | |
| Application Papers | | | | | | |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examine | er. | | | | | |
| 10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acce | epted or b)⊡ objected to by the E xa | miner. | | | | |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the | | | | | | |
| 11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner. | | | | | | |
| If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action. | | | | | | |
| 12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120 | | | | | | |
| 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). | | | | | | |
| a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: | | | | | | |
| Certified copies of the priority document | ts have been received. | | | | | |
| Certified copies of the priority document | its have been received in Applicat | ion No | | | | |
| 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prical application from the International B * See the attached detailed Office action for a lis | ureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). | | | | | |
| 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domes | | | | | | |
| a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language pr 15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domes | rovisional application has been re | ceived. | | | | |
| Attachment(s) | | | | | | |
| 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) | 5) Notice of Informal | ry (PTO-413) Paper No(s) Patent Application (PTO-152) | | | | |

Application/Control Number: 09/666,524

Art Unit: 2862

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 107, 108, 120, 121, 156-159, 163, 164 and 179-182 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thompson in view of Goldfine et al (W098/40732), both of record.

Thompson discloses mount a magnetic sensor under the head of a fastener for monitoring damage to the fastener. Thompson fails to disclose mounting an eddy sensor to a substrate. Goldfine teaches embedding an eddy current sensor on a substrate in difficult to access locations (see page 25, lines 17-21). It would have been obvious to use an eddy current sensor as claimed with the device of Thompson in view of the teaching of Goldfine.

- 3. Claims 110 and 111 remain rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph as act forth in the previous office action.
- 4. Claims 145-155, 160, 162, 165-172 and 176-178 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 5. Claims 109, 112-119, 161 and 173-175 are allowed.

Art Unit: 2862

Snow/ek

09/25/03

Walter E. Snow Primary Examiner